REMARKS

In the Office Action of July 14, 2006, the Examiner noted claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 11-18 are pending and rejected claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 11-18. Claims 1, 4-8, 11,12 and 16 have been amended, claims 17 and 18 have been cancelled. Thus, in view of the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 11-16 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 8 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Miller et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,585,866 (hereinafter called Miller). Miller is directed to a system for displaying a programming guide on a receiver system of a cable or satellite television unit. The current claims are to a method or apparatus for extracting objects from scenes of a broadcast and setting up information so that those objects may be advertised within the broadcast, when this information is used to recruit sponsors for the advertisement. Miller does not disclose "receiving the program information about a program to be broadcast from the broadcasting unit and sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying an object displayed during and a part of the program on a display screen displaying the program," as recited in claim 8. Miller discusses the use of advertisements, column 13 lines 48-53, but only to state that "[w]ith the advent of sophisticated television receivers, it may also be possible to simultaneously … split the screen to show, for example, broadcast programs in combination with advertisements."

Miller does not suggest how a sponsor of such an advertisement would be recruited. Therefore Miller does not disclose "sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor." As Miller does not disclose any way of acquiring a sponsor, it follows that there is no need to retain sponsor-recruiting information, therefore, Miller does not disclose "storing the program information and sponsor-recruiting information; outputting the stored program information and sponsor-recruiting information."

Further, Miller does not teach "transmitting sponsor-designating information to the broadcasting unit for designating that the owner of the receiving unit becomes the sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying the object to said broadcasting unit." Miller at column 8, lines 24-27 discusses recording the purchase of a pay-per-view program, not a sponsor paying for an advertisement. For the reasons stated above claims 8 and 16 are not anticipated by Miller.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11-14, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Rhoads et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,050,603 (hereinafter called Rhoads). Rhoads discusses the use of watermarks as pertains to objects in a video signal. As regards claims 1, 2, 11, 13 and

17, Rhoads does not disclose the "extracting an object appearing in a program which is to be broadcast so as to generate an object extraction table in accordance with the information of the time or frame and display position of the object on a screen," as recited in claim 1 for example. Rhoads discusses the extracting of an object, but not the generation of an "object extraction table." The statement that a "database looks up an action associated with watermark information extracted from content, " Rhoads Column 5, lines 5-6 is not a description of a database lookup in an object extraction table, but discusses a lookup of ***actions*** associated with watermark information.

Rhoads column 19, lines 60-67 states:

> Video objects representing advertising or promotions may be watermark enabled. For example, an advertiser such as Ford would produce a watermark enabled ad that would pop up specifically for users to click. The promo could be "NFL on ESPN . . . Brought to You By FORD" and while that logo or graphic spins there for twenty seconds Ford is offering a promotional discount or freebie for all the people that click on it to visit there site during that time. The video programmer could run the video objects many times so people who miss it could get another chance.

Which is simply the watermarking of video objects within an advertisement. Such an encoding is different than "generating advertisement information about the extracted object, which is carried out principally with reference to said object extraction table correlating the advertisement information to the object using the frame and the display position of the object," as recited in claim 1. Rhoads is not generating advertisement information about the extracted video object, it is watermarking video objects within the advertisement. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found at page 22 lines 5-6 of the application. Claims 6, 11, and 12 amended in a similar manner.

Further, as there is no generation of advertisement information as recited in claim 1, then Rhoads cannot teach, "transmitting the program information, advertisement information, and sync information to said receiving unit separately from the program," as recited in claim 1. As the advertisement information is not generated there is no need for "sync information" to link the advertising information with the program information. Support for the amendment to claim 1 found on page 10 lines 6-8. Claims 6, 11, and 12 amended in a similar manner.

As regards claims 6, 12 and 14 Rhoads does not disclose "extracting an object appearing in a program which is to be broadcast to generate an object extraction table in accordance with the information of the time or frame and display position of the object on a screen," as recited in claim 6. As argued above, Rhoads does not teach the use of an "object extraction table." As Rhoades does not teach an "object extraction table," it follows that Rhoads

does not suggest "generating the relevant information about the extracted object, which is carried out principally with reference to said object extraction table."

Further Rhoads does not teach "generating the sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying the extracted object," as recited in claim 6. Rhoads, discusses the displaying of advertisements with actions associated therewith, but does not teach a means of recruiting a sponsor (i.e. the person paying for the advertisement). As Rhoads does not disclose "sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor," it further does not teach "transmitting the program information and the sponsor-recruiting information to said receiving unit." For the reasons stated above, claims 1, 2, 6 and 11-14 are not anticipated by Rhoads.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kitsukawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,282,713 (hereinafter called Kitsukawa), in view of Rhoads. Examiner admitted that Kitsukawa does not disclose sync information but asserted that Rhoads does. As discussed above, Rhoads has no need of sync information as no relationship between advertising information and program information need be described.

Further, Kitsukawa at column 6, lines 54-58 states "the advertising information may be received prior to receipt of the scenes or television programs in which the identified items corresponding to the advertising information appear, in which case the advertising information is stored." As Kitsukawa does not disclose the information being transmitted in any particular order, it does not disclose, "synchronously outputting the program information and relevant information in accordance with the stored sync information." Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Kitsukawa or Rhoads taken alone or in combination fail disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claims 7 and 15.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Rhoads in view of Narayan, International Publication No. WO 01/03044 (hereinafter called Narayan). As argued above, Rhoads does not disclose the elements of independent claim 1. Narayan adds nothing to Rhoads that would that would sustain a rejection for obviousness as to independent claim 1 or to the further limitations of dependent claims 4 and 5.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 16, 2006

By: _____
James J. Livingston
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501